DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 142 95 SP 008 244

AUTHOR	Larson, Rolf W.
TITLE	Accreditation Problems and the Promise of PBTE.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Nov 74
NOTE	32p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, No. 1 Dupont Circle, N. W., Suite 610, Washington, D. C. 20036 (no price quoted)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Standards; *Accreditation (Institutions); Admission Criteria; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Schools of Education; *Teacher Education; Teacher Education Curriculum

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the relationship between the accreditation of teacher education institutions and performance-based teacher education. After a brief historical review, the author discusses four basic accreditation problems: (a) the need to allow for institutional differences; (b) the need to base decisions on substance rather than on form, (c) the need to determine the actual qualifications of the graduate, and (d) the need to determine the focus or function of accreditation. Institutional statements of objectives for teacher education are frequently vague and provide little guidance for the accrediting team. The objectives of one institution are examined in detail to illustrate these problems. Performance-based teacher education, which requires the explicit definition of expected competencies, could help to move accreditation toward being based on elements of substantive achievement and could encourage a rethinking of admissions criteria. Finally, the two purposes of accreditation are considered; whether it should be used to identify institutions which meet a minimum set of standards or to stimulate institutions to improve their programs significantly. (MBM)

EC 098142

ACCREDITATION PROBLEMS AND THE PROMISE OF PBTE

by Rolf W. Larson

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Published by

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Number One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

and

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
Number One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

November 1974

SP 008 244

SP008 244

The Clearinghouse is sponsored by: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (fiscal agent); Association of Teacher Educators; Instruction and Professional Development, National Education Association

---

This paper does not necessarily reflect the viewpoint of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). AACTE is printing this paper to stimulate discussion, study and experimentation among educators.

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to Emporia Kansas State College for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either Emporia Kansas State College or the National Institute of Education.

FOREWORD

In 1970 the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education approved and adopted new accreditation standards. These standards, which the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education helped to formulate, encourage experimentation with new kinds of programs like performance-based teacher education. They also incorporate ideas which are essential to PBTE programs, e.g., specific and explicit program objectives, involvement of students, field-based elements in the program, evaluation of graduates, and program evaluation, feedback, and revision.

During the past four or five years, an increasing number of colleges and universities have been experimenting with PBTE training programs. A number of states have taken action to move towards a performance base in teacher education and certification. AACTE has attempted to give direction to this national movement through its PBTE project. It has published monographs, sponsored training conferences, and established a national information center.

AACTE is publishing this paper because it believes it deserves wide visibility. The paper was commissioned by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education in keeping with the Clearinghouse's policy of offering analytical papers on topics of concern to teacher educators.

November 1974

--Edward C. Pomeroy
Executive Director, AACTE

--Joost Yff
Director, ERIC
Clearinghouse on
Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the relationship between the accreditation of teacher education institutions and performance-based teacher education. After a brief historical review, the author discusses four basic accreditation problems: (a) the need to allow for institutional differences; (b) the need to base decisions on substance rather than on form, (c) the need to determine the actual qualifications of the graduate, and (d) the need to determine the focus or function of accreditation. Institutional statements of objectives for teacher education are frequently vague and provide little guidance for the accrediting team. The objectives of one institution are examined in detail to illustrate these problems. Performance-based teacher education, which requires the explicit definition of expected competencies, could help to move accreditation toward being based on elements of substantive achievement and could encourage a rethinking of admissions criteria. Finally, the two purposes of accreditation are considered; whether it should be used to identify institutions which meet a minimum set of standards or to stimulate institutions to improve their programs significantly. (MBM)

ERIC DESCRIPTORS

To expand a bibliography using ERIC, descriptors or search terms are used. To use a descriptor: (1) Look up the descriptor in the SUBJECT INDEX of monthly, semi-annual, or annual issue of Research in Education (RIE). (2) Beneath the descriptors you will find title(s) of documents. Decide which title(s) you wish to pursue. (3) Note the "ED" number beside the title. (4) Look up the "ED" number in the "DOCUMENT RESUME SECTION" of the appropriate issue of RIE. With the number you will find a summary of the document and often the document's cost in microfiche and/or hardcopy. (5) Repeat the above procedure, if desired, for other issues of RIE and for other descriptors. (6) For information about how to order ERIC documents, turn to the back pages of RIE. (7) Indexes and annotations of journal articles can be found in Current Index to Journals in Education by following the same procedure. Periodical articles cannot be secured through ERIC.

TOPIC: *"Accreditation Problems and the Promise of PBTE."*

DESCRIPTORS TO USE IN CONTINUING SEARCH OF RIE AND CIJE:

*Teacher Education
*Performance Based Teacher Education
Schools of Education
Teacher Education Curriculum
*Accreditation (Institutions)
Academic Standards
Admission Criteria

*Asterisk(s) indicate major descriptors.

OVERVIEW

During the nineteenth century, especially as it was coming to a close, people who were developing a system of higher education in this country became concerned over the diverse quality of different institutions. Students could choose from among not only the older and well-established, private universities of the east and the developing state universities, but academies and small, private institutions which seemed to be springing up everywhere. The country had rejected vesting control of higher education in the hands of a strong federal agency. It had tried and rejected the concept of putting such power into the hands of a university, as the British had done.

As a result of this rejection of several operating patterns, a new system had to be developed. This system, the accreditation movement of today, is an effort at quality control of programs (or institutions) based on peer evaluation. In this system, basic institutional quality is assured through the evaluation efforts of regional accrediting associations. These associations also extend their efforts to the evaluation and accreditation of secondary schools and, in some cases, of elementary schools.

The evaluation efforts to assure quality in professional programs are undertaken by what are called specialized or professional accrediting agencies, of which there are now over 30. The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education is one of these agencies. Like them, NCATE focuses on specific programs to prepare specialists in its field. In teacher education, programs to prepare elementary and secondary teachers, principals, supervisors, school counselors, school superintendents, and school psychologists are examined. Involved in the evaluative efforts are practicing school people--teachers, principals and counselors, among others--and collegiate personnel representing elementary and secondary theory, foundations, and research work, school administration, and pupil personnel work. Teams of evaluators so comprised evaluate training programs which result in licensure, certification, or official recognition of some other kind which serves as an entry to practice within the teaching profession.

It is not the task of this paper to explore in any detail the problems of the accrediting movement or the accrediting association. It also does not explore the problems of performance-based teacher education as a movement, nor make quality judgments about that movement. Rather, its principal purpose is to examine certain accreditation problems in the light of performance-based teacher education to see how PBTE theory might alleviate specific accreditation problems.

The points of view expressed in this paper are personal and do not reflect, except by coincidence, any official position taken by NCATE or any of its individual members.

SOME TEACHER EDUCATION ACCREDITATION PROBLEMS

We have selected four basic accreditation problems. They are, in outline:

1. The problem of allowing for institutional differences in a common accreditation evaluation,

2. The problem of basing accreditation decisions on real college substance rather than on elements of form,

3. The problem of determining the actual qualifications of the graduate, and

4. The problem of determining the focus or function of accreditation.

Institutional differences. As this new American development called "accreditation" moved forward with a set of policies and a rationale, one basic principle emerged rather clearly. That is, accreditation activities and policies must not deny to institutions the right to be the kind of institution each wanted to be, so long as the quality of its product met acceptable societal demands. This principle, which is today a basic tenet on which accreditation operates, allows a large, empirically oriented institution, supported by public funds, to do and to be what it feels is best, while allowing a small, humanistically oriented, private, liberal arts institution to follow its own pathway to the baccalaureate degree. To put it more precisely in terms of teacher education, the multi-university must be allowed its prerogatives in developing an English teacher (subject, of course, to the meeting of state requirements for a teaching license), while the small and private, often religiously oriented, college, steeped in its own concept of academic and humanistic tradition, must be allowed to exercise its prerogatives in developing what it thinks a good English teacher is.

It is true that the state's licensing requirements, which both institutions must meet, make them more alike than might otherwise be true. However, the requirements of the typical state department of education are usually general and refer only to courses (or other educational experiences). Furthermore, it is well-established that state departments of education are becoming increasingly more liberal in their licensing requirements. Even when requirements are specific, e.g., each student must have a three-hour course in educational psychology,

the institution is still free to apply its own value system and to teach the kind of educational psychology it finds most meaningful. One institution, spurred by a department filled with experimental psychologists, might develop three hours of educational psychology rooted in empiricism and behaviorism; another institution could be as Freudian, gestaltist, or perceptual-theory oriented as it desired to be. Likewise, a requirement for a course in educational philosophy never precludes the study of scholasticism at one institution, idealism at a second, and pragmatism at a third.

An accrediting agency, of course, is allowed some freedom of action in assessing the value system operating at a given institution. Generally, it accepts without argument a wide band of values which are acceptable to the public as a whole. When institutions depart radically from accepted ideas and appear to be advocating the preparation of a teacher, a doctor, or some other professional in startlingly different terms, the accrediting agency and the institution must come to terms with one another. The institution, naturally, may argue that its departure from standard norms is badly needed by society and by a profession is adhering to principles no longer tenable. The accrediting agency, on the other hand, is supposed to curb efforts which seem designed not to serve well the needs of society.

Form vs. substance. Accreditation decisions for all agencies are too often based on elements of institutional form--Ph.D. ratios, book counts, curricular requirements, admission test scores, and others. These criteria are increasingly being challenged as unimportant or meaningless--little related to the fundamental values which the college is trying to achieve; yet, they commonly are the only bases available for judgment.

Accreditation based on the "substance" of an institution and on a demonstration of achievement within an area of study is extremely difficult. It is easier to base a decision about accreditation on a book count than on the use to which those books are put. It is easier to base a decision on class size (e.g., no professor can teacher a class of over 30 students) than on a professor's effect, even though some professors teaching 100 students at a time are more stimulating, cover more content, touch students more emotionally and intellectually than do others with classes of only 10. In accrediting agencies, everyone would like to base accreditation decisions on true substance rather than on artifical elements of form. Honest institutional administrators likewise want their institutions to be judged on the basis of their substance, their accomplishments, rather than on the character of their physical plants, the Ph.D.'s of their faculties, and the SAT scores of their students.

The problem is that the substantive elements desired as a basis for making judgments are those least easily identified, quantified, and presented. They are ethereal, difficult to define and evaluate for those who have the task of arriving at decisions. All too often in present accreditation, these desirable substance qualities, instead of being defined and demonstrated, are merely *said to be present*. This is particularly true when the form is deficient. "Of course, our students are good," the institution says; or, "The superintendents tell us they would rather have our product than any other around." Institutional reports are full of reassurances (unsupported assertions) that faculty members are devoted, good teachers (even though they do not have Ph.D.'s or publish), that they select good students (who have many redeeming human qualities even though their SAT scores are low), and so on. They assume that their assertions of substance warrant accreditation.

On the other hand, when the elements of form are clearly visible and appear to meet standards, the institution usually rests its case on form. If the accreditation operation suggests that in spite of a large percentage of Ph.D.'s, the teaching is pretty bad; or in spite of library holdings that exceed the American Library Association formula, books really are not being used; or in spite of high student SAT mean scores, students do not show much interest in professional development, the institution is quick to challenge the team's conclusion. It is an anomaly that it seems to be necessary to demonstrate substance only when form is shaky.

Student qualifications. NCATE, like other agencies, devotes an entire section of its standards to the selection, retention, and graduation of students. The object, of course, is to assure the public, through its rigorous application of personnel standards, that promising and competent teachers are emerging from our colleges and universities. The accreditation problem is to demonstrate that a competent professional is indeed emerging.

NCATE evaluators have expressed dissatisfaction and frustration when applying selection and retention standards. They have said that they can find only one admission or retention criterion which is really operative: the grade point average. Institutions collect other data. General aptitude test scores (i.e., SAT, ACT, GRE scores) are often collected; recommendations are solicited; good communication skills are presumably required. Yet, the qualifications which are supposed to assure "professional promise" are often defined by a grade point average. Communications ability is assured by "at least a C average" in English 1 and 2 and perhaps the basic speech course. A thorough, comprehensive, and usable grasp of history is defined by a cumulative GPA of 2.5. Skill and ability to teach children how to read is accepted by a C in the course, assured by a B, and certain with an A.

The fact is that for most institutions there is no delineation of teacher competence, skill, or knowledge. Reduced to its essence, preparing for teaching is a matter of graduating from college in most institutions. There is a six- or eight-week period of practice specified (student teaching), but this is usually carefully controlled and, some say, it is not a real test of ability. The problem is that of knowing what skills and knowledge are really possessed by the student which make him "qualified" for entering into the profession of teaching.

Focus of accreditation: This problem is broader, more philosophical, and very important for the accrediting agency to have thought through carefully. The problems are that of providing a suitable framework for the accreditation functions to be accomplished within and of deciding as precisely as possible what the accreditation activities should accomplish.

Most accreditation agencies have come into being to correct deficiencies noted by the profession or society: teachers are poorly prepared; schools are in a state of shock and disrepair; schools of education are unable to meet the challenge of preparing teachers adequately. There are some who believe that teacher education ought to be turned over to selected city school systems. There are some who believe that teacher preparation is not necessary at all, that one can take a reasonably well-educated college graduate, grounded in an academic discipline, and put him into a classroom without further ado.

This uncertainty about teacher education can be used to define one of several basic purposes or functions of the accreditation act, namely, the application of a set of basic, minimum standards designed to correct the deficiencies said to exist and to raise the level of collegiate training. A profession, faced with society's uproar about the condition of the training for entry into its positions, can create an accrediting agency, adopt standards designed to correct deficiencies, and then apply those standards to institutions, demanding reforms and holding the institutions to high standards of performance. In the parlance of accrediting agencies, this function is that of "applying minimum standards." The basic purpose of the agency, in this point of view, is to identify those institutions whose operational qualities meet or exceed the set of standards adopted and, after such identification, to reveal to the public eye the names of the institutions and their qualified programs through some kind of publication. When this function for accreditation governs, the accrediting agency refuses to grant accreditation or recognition to some colleges or universities which, in the agency's judgment, do not meet the standards being applied at some predetermined acceptable level.

Counter to the philosophy or purpose of "applying minimum standards" is the philosophy which holds that the primary value of accreditation lies in its "stimulating and growth-producing power." The agency's list of accredited institutions then will contain all or most of the institutions preparing teachers (or doctors, or foresters), with no special attempt to keep many institutions off the approved list. Of course, even with the application of this philosophy, the agency will not accredit completely deficient institutions, but generally most institutions with reasonable practice and promise will be accredited. The idea, in homely terms, is to get the institution into the family and, once that happens, devote every effort to the improvement of the institution's programs and conditions, with the accrediting agency applying pressure selectively and steadily as problem after problem is addressed and remedied over the years.

Most professional accrediting agencies have come into existence because of conditions which have demanded a rigorous application of standards to raise the level of training for entry into the profession in order to better protect the public. As the years pass, and as the list of accredited institutions grows to include most of the colleges which have programs to prepare for entry into that profession, the accrediting agency begins a natural drift from its original restrictive and demanding position of "applying standards" to the now more natural one of "stimulating" those which have already met standards but need to be reminded periodically not to let down or go to seed. NCATE has shared this drift with other accrediting agencies. Yet it is still young enough and the drift is not yet so complete as to have eliminated the debate as to whether its primary purpose in accrediting activities should still be the rigorous application of standards or should be that of stimulation.

RELATING THE PROBLEMS TO PBTE

Institutional Differences

The examination of this problem might well begin with a look at institutional statements about goals and objectives for teacher education. It is these statements, presumably, which will reveal to evaluators what it is that the institution is seeking to accomplish. A comparison of such statements from institution to institution should reveal how they differ from one another in what they seek to accomplish. To illustrate:

1. *Preparing teachers.* Statements from one institution point clearly to its intention to prepare an elementary teacher who will take a job in a self-contained classroom, who will have some knowledge of every subject field, and who will have some skill for dealing with

the problems of each field; another institution, perhaps city based, will make clear that its goal is to prepare an elementary teacher who will take a position in a school where a physical education staff will take care of one area of development, an art staff will take care of another area, and a music staff will cover still another. The statements of the first institution will clearly define the enlarged area of content and methodology training; the statements of the second will show a more restricted or redirected training, covering a set of basic competencies but adding additional competencies, such as identifying and meeting the particular learning needs of problem children of one kind or another.

2. *Preparing administrators.* Some institutions make it quite clear that their goal is to prepare as good, as efficient, and as capable a practicing school administrator as it is possible to prepare from the standpoint of operating competencies. They do not pretend to be developing research-oriented administrators. They do not pretend to be developing theoreticians in administration. Other institutions may, by their own direction, be both theory and research oriented instead of practice oriented.

It is NCATE's judgment that choices such as these belong to the institution. Council members may differ in their choice of values; one may be highly research oriented and another practice oriented. What is important for the accreditation activities, however, is that the institution make perfectly clear what its goals are so that the evaluation can be conducted in those terms. An institution which aims at preparing elementary teachers for a self-contained classroom can then be evaluated, in part at least, by what it does to get its teachers prepared to teach elements of music and art.

Supporters of performance-based education frequently refer to the inadequacies of institutional statements of goal and purpose. Several recent (1973) accreditation reports, selected at random, illustrate how schools and departments of education, as well as subject matter departments, typically describe what they are seeking to accomplish in their programs.

--To develop an understanding of those characteristics involved in the learning process of children. *(No further definition of "those" is given.)*

--To develop an overall comprehension in students as to what music really is.

--To develop some competence in many studio areas so that prospective teachers will be able to aid young students in various directions. *(This was for an art program. No help was given to understand how much competence "some" competence was, what "studio areas" would be involved, or "what directions" the institution intended.)*

--To gain economic knowledge sufficient to improve the economic literacy of high school students.

--To have skill in listening, speaking, and writing.

--To develop the ability to understand conversation, lecture, and news broadcasts. *(This came from a foreign language department.)*

--To develop an awareness of language as an element of culture.

--To develop insights into the theoretical basis of the practice of education.

--To equip the science teacher with at least minimal mathematical competencies.

--To plan units of instruction.

The objectives listed above were extracted from pages of specific program goals--things to be achieved within a 36-hour program of music courses or science courses, or within the 12 hours of education courses required to prepare for teaching. An examination of broader objectives or goals for preparing all kinds of teachers, as might be stated by a school of education, reveals the regular use of statements such as the following:

--To develop a sound grasp of the subject content which the teacher is expected to teach. *(This statement, presented in a variety of ways, is almost universal.)*

--To develop an understanding of the teaching-learning process.

--To develop (sound) (acceptable) (desirable) attitudes toward children and youth.

--To develop an understanding of the American School System and of the philosophical thoughts which are used to define its purposes.

And so on. Each reader will have his own reaction to the statements, and these reactions will undoubtedly range from "Well, what's so wrong with them?" to "They are incredibly vague and are the source of our problem." While institutional accreditation reports to the Council are not expected to contain every statement of goal and objective made by an institution (those for the institution as a whole, those intended to be descriptive of all teachers whatever the major, and those intended to be specific for individual teaching fields), they are expected to illustrate the goals the college seeks. These statements serve as a starting point for a visiting team which will talk to professors, examine course syllabi, and see in greater detail than a typical report can give, what the institution is trying to do.

Imagine we are members of an evaluating committee. There several questions we might ask if we were faced with the evaluation of the following goal, chosen from the illustrations above:

"To develop an awareness of language as an element of culture."

Question Set 1. What curricular content, if we were examining the curriculum to assess the chances that such an awareness would be developed, would we want to see? What curricular content would be likely to promote such a competence? What curricular content would not be likely to promote it? How could we tell what the chances were for having a student emerge from an English major with such an awareness?

Question Set 2. How would we know whether such an outcome had been achieved? What things might the student do, or what things might the student say, that would give us a clue that he had become "aware"? How would we measure the achievement of such a goal?

Question Set 3. Suppose that we concluded that the student was not "aware," who or what could be held accountable? What could the accreditation agency point to as being the cause of the inadequacy? Did the student not study his appointed 36 hours of English? Was he an insensitive clod? Was the potential there in the academic content but the professors missed the boat? Who or what can be pinned down as accountable?

Question Set 4. Suppose we were convinced that there was an inadequacy, that the goal had not been met, and suppose that the institution determined it was going to correct the situation, What could be proposed to a provost, to a president, to a tough state comptroller, or to a state legislature to correct the situation? New courses? New equipment? More professors?

Question Set 5. While the goal is an interesting one, in what ways is it related to skill and success in being an English teacher? How would such awareness accomplish ends which mothers and fathers want for their children? Is it of high value for the institution or of relatively low value? (The institution's list indicated no priority values except what might be read into the serial order of the points.) Is this seen as more important than others which were not on this institution's list, but might be put on other lists? (For example the identification of reading problems was not on this list; presumably the institution which listed the awareness goal as on outcome but did not list any goal related to reading skills believes that it is more important for a college student to understand the cultural implications of language usage than to be able to identify a student's reading problems.)

Some critics feel that the inadequacies apparent in the foregoing objectives are indicative of a "cop-out" by the institution, that they represent a retreat from responsibility which is endemic with higher education. When the faculty expresses itself in the institutional literature as wanting to develop "at least minimal mathematical competencies" or "awareness of language as an element of culture" or a "comprehension of what music really is" or even "understanding of children," it cannot be pinned down about the meaning. Almost any course can be defended as developing awareness or increasing understanding if one has never been specific about what that means. If "sociological" awarenesses (stated generally) are desired, the first sociology course in the college catalog is a natural solution. Insights into psychological matters readily call for a course in adolescent problems or learning theory. Who can quarrel with a requirement for a course in semantics to develop an awareness of the role of language as an element of culture? With language this general, one cannot prove that the institution has not reached its goals.

Finally, the meaning of a letter grade is nearly as ill defined as the goal and the vehicle for reaching it. For example, since we usually do not define the "psychological insights" we want a student to develop and do not exactly know how the course in adolescent psychology relates to those insights, a grade of B (for which we do not know the exact meaning as defined in terms of attainment of insights) is just as good as any other indicator of the success with which a student has completed the course.

A case study. The above objectives and comments are based on a number of institutional reports. It may be useful now to examine in greater detail the objectives of one institution to see if there is an explicit institutional position which can then be evaluated.

For illustrative purposes, an effort has been made to isolate pertinent information relating to the preparation of biology teachers for one institution. The entire report was read but attention was focused primarily on the institution's statements of (a) general secondary education goals, (b) goals for biology teachers, (c) the curriculum for biology teachers, and (d) evaluative results obtained by the institution to demonstrate the quality of its biology teachers.

Opening statements by the institution indicate that students preparing to be secondary-level biology teachers take 56 semester hours of general studies, divided into four major classifications. These courses include typical composition courses, a speech course, any mathematics course desired by a student, a year of biological science, a year of physical science, a general psychology course, two English literature courses, a fine arts course, History of Western Civilization in two courses, two additional social studies choices, an orientation, a health course, and related physical education activities.

No overall statements conceptualizing secondary education in general are given by the institution. However, in the portion of the report that describes the preparation of biology teachers, the institution lists the following 10 skills which biology teachers are expected to possess:

1. Outline the historical development of science as a discipline,
2. Discuss the place and purpose of science,
3. Delineate and use modern methods of teaching the special subject matter related to their major,
4. Plan units of instruction,
5. State and use various sources of instructional materials,
6. Acquaint pupils with laboratory procedures,
7. Discuss the development of the science fair program and judge such exhibits,
8. Use the most recent methods of presenting scientific information,
9. Exhibit knowledge of recent trends and concepts in the subject matter area related to their major, and
10. Lead a survey of the field of study corresponding to the major.

The institution then indicates that a major of 37 semester hours in biology is required to give the student (a) working knowledge of plants (Bio. A and B), a knowledge of the animal kingdom in phylogenetic order (Bio. C and D), animal and plant cells (Bio. E), and so on. The student is also required to take two mathematics courses to gain enough knowledge to understand probability and the recessive traits in plants and animals.

Professional training includes two psychology courses (Adolescent and Educational Psychology) to give the necessary psychological perspective; a course in general methods; a course called "Teaching of the Sciences"; a course in the evaluation of instruction; and student teaching, for which six hours of credit is given. In the science methods course, students are required, among other things presumably, to give written reports on 20 articles in science education, develop a unit plan, and engage in a 20-minute teaching experience with peers.

Student teaching is for six weeks. The institution states that it believes its choice of teaching sites is good. Most are near the institution, with student teachers often placed with teachers who have earlier graduated from the parent institution. Supervision comes both from biology professors (faculty sheets show biology professors who were formerly teachers in high school) and from the School of Education. Rating sheets are completed after each supervising visit; the visits occur at least four times during the student teaching experience. Student self-rating sheets are utilized but are not necessarily used in determining the final grade. The cooperating high school biology teacher completes rating sheets, which are turned over to the college supervisor as a part of the total evaluation package. The student teaching rating scale was not included as an exhibit in the report's Appendix, although other documents are shown there.

A rating instrument developed at the college was sent to 54 school administrators in 6 states. The 36 questionnaires which were returned for analysis showed the following:

1. The institution's graduates, when compared with graduates at other institutions, were rated above average 60 percent of the time on 3 of the 5 professional characteristics listed, were rated above average 60 percent of the time on 3 of 7 personal characteristics listed, and were rated above average 60 percent of the time on 2 of 7 statements referring to classroom practice.

2. Graduates were rated average on 7 characteristics, 2 of which (for illustration) are working with staff colleagues and accepting responsibility for special assignments.

3. Students were shown to be average to above average on 11 traits when compared to the graduates of other institutions. Illustrative of this group of traits are using time for reading, participating in professional organizations, and wearing appropriate dress and having good grooming.

The institution notes, of course, that other, more informal means of evaluation are going on all the time, one of which is the recurring contacts of placement personnel with employers in the field; another, the informal contacts made frequently between college personnel, public school personnel, and former graduates.

The team report provides only a little more assurance. After attesting to the validity of what the institution has written, the team cites some of the free responses contained in the evaluation instrument. They indicate that employers find the institution's product "the best we employ" or "ranked with the best" or "always doing an outstanding job." These remarks are not treated in an empirical manner. The team apparently concluded that since the desirability of the institution's graduates was great (over 1,300 have been placed in the 35 school systems responding), the graduates could be evaluated as being competent.

Having just read the institutional report in its entirety and having read through essential portions of the college catalog, what do we know about the institution? What is it trying to do? What special things is it seeking to accomplish? What particular kind of teacher are we likely to see emerging from its teacher preparation programs?

We know what kind of college it is. We know that it is fairly small and that the preparation of teachers is still a major function at the institution. We have some basic statistics: size of faculty, size of library, curricula available, admissions requirements, some background on its administrative officers. The dean of the School of Education has recently been involved in public school work and has been a public school teacher. The institution is in a fairly rural part of its state and is located in a small town. The student body is predominantly white. No large city areas exist near enough to make us believe that it is likely to have a high percentage of city youth.

Is the institution preparing secondary teachers in general, and biology teachers in particular, for the rural segment of its state? Or is it, in spite of its location, undertaking to prepare a significant number of teachers for city teaching or for the teaching of underprivileged or minority students? If either is true, what does the institution see as desirable characteristics and necessary skills which have to be developed? At this point, we do not know answers to any of these questions.

Is this a unique institution regardless of its geographical location or student body? Has some accident or design conspired to bring to this campus a particular group of faculty members and administrators who have built a dream, who have fashioned a unique concept of what a college education could or should be? Is there some local thrust which hopes to put its own stamp on each student so forcibly that as those graduates enter teaching, others will observe and remark that surely he (the graduate) must have come from X (this institution). Again, at this point, we do not know answers to any of these questions, but we can, I think, doubt that such is the case.

How, then, can we judge this institution fairly *in its own terms?* It has not shown us its terms. We know only the type of institution it is and its geography. We know that it wants to teach its biology students about plants and animals and probability theory. We know that the institution wants the student to know some philosophy of education, some psychology about children and learning, and some methodology. No stress on humanistic matters has been made apparent; no research orientation has been made apparent; no concepts relating to geography, to sociological conditions, or to population groups have been revealed. We conclude that this is one of many institutions that wants its students to "know their subject," to "understand and love children," and "know something about how to run a classroom." And undoubtedly the institution wants its graduates to be good and understanding people as they deal with students.

In any NCATE evaluation, the institutional report has two primary exposures. First, it is read by members of a team numbering from 6 to 10 or 12, and later, it is studied in detail by a 9-member evaluation board. In this total of between 15 and 25 persons, it is unlikely that more than 2 have had a recent, direct experience with a college biology program. Rather, they are practicing school superintendents or principals, professors of administration, college deans and presidents, practicing school teachers, guidance workers, and occasionally a school board member. Each of these persons, however dedicated, brings to the accreditation decision making his own concept of what a biology teacher should know and be able to do.

In the absence of explicit statements about what the institution's concept is, what it is trying to do, and how it is trying to do it, the team evaluator appears to have two main options open to him as he evaluates. He can, in the first place, accept the vague statements of the institution as indicative of good faith, excuse the looseness of the language as being the prose of people who like to keep their options open, and vote for accreditation (or a supportive report). Since most evaluators are rather dedicated to the idea that an NCATE evaluation should up-grade the operation of an institution, this is not an attractive option. The other alternative is to evaluate on the basis of his own

conception of what the program ought to be. Using the *Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education* as a guide for his thinking, he can examine first the structural elements of the program--an exposure to the psychological foundations, laboratory experiences in preparation for student teaching, the student teaching itself, the elements comprising the major in biology, and so on. But after examining them there comes the moment when he must assess the over-all worth of the program. At that point, unless the institution has clearly stated its goals, curriculum, and achieved result (based on goals), each evaluator will have to substitute his own value system. If the psychological learning base intended is behavioral and an evaluator is a gestaltist, the institution's chances for having its program accredited are materially decreased. The team and the evaluation board are hardly to be criticized for acting on the basis of their own best, combined concepts when the clues from the institution are minimal.

The reader may conclude, as the writer has, that in the foregoing example little of the "individualism" of the college has been made explicit. It is the writer's opinion that this is true of other colleges. Even when a "unique" trait is identified, it is often a global, poorly defined concept. A common example is "liberal arts" (as contrasted with some other unmentioned and undefined concept which, it is presumed, the reader knows). Precisely what is defined by the words "liberal arts" and what that suggests about "other" (nonliberal arts) programs is seldom made explicit.

Institutional practices more often than not work to counter the fundamental accreditation premise that the institution should be evaluated in its own terms to the maximum degree possible. The truth is that the institution seldom reveals its terms in much detail. Evaluators must, of necessity, bring their own best judgment (and value systems) to an evaluation of the program. The institutional uniqueness may suffer in the process.

This situation runs counter to the performance-based teacher education concept. PBTE asks the institution to be explicit, to be behavioral, or to be operational in its statements of purpose and goal at a general institutional level, at a midrange level when describing competencies for all teachers, and at a specific level when describing the competencies for specific teachers. PBTE asks the institution to be specific in outlining curriculum content (whether in the form of courses or modules of instruction) designed specifically to develop the competencies being sought in that period of learning. PBTE contains, as a part of the system, an evaluative effort or apparatus which is designed to determine that the understanding or the competency has been accomplished before the student moves on to further instructional experiences. Not

one of these three criteria for a PBTE program is typically found in the average teacher education program. The goals are set in nonspecific or nonbehavioral language. The curricular experiences are assigned almost universally from a pool of college courses. Aside from college examinations designed to indicate mastery of the verbal content of the course, little evaluation is made to determine whether the desired competencies have been acquired. It is easy to conclude that some application of PBTE theory would be helpful in alleviating this first problem of accreditation.

Form versus Substance

As mentioned earlier, one of the hopes of most of those engaged in accreditation evaluations is that they will estimate the true worth and substance of the institutional program, while disregarding, as far as possible, its form. Again, let us examine the preparation of the biology teacher in the illustration just given and see to what degree this evaluation might be based on form or substance.

First, let us examine the program of general studies. Fifty-six hours are required. The visiting team has apparently checked the records of students and has reassured later evaluators that the necessary credits have been earned, the necessary courses taken, the categories of requirements fulfilled. The conclusion is reached that the standards relating to a program of general studies have been met and the program is adequate. This is what evaluators in accreditation activities call "form."

While there is probably less institutional agreement on the outcomes desired in general education than in any other part of the program, let us, for purposes of discussion, suggest a few that are common. Has an exposure to one or more of the fine arts resulted in any appreciable change in the beauty and harmony of the student's life style? We do not know. For these questions and for many others--others which relate to health and physical activity, to economics, to insights into human behavior, and so on--we have no answers which are substantive. Even when professors get occasional insights about improved thinking processes, enlightened attitudes about other human beings, more beauty and order in individual living, they remain untold and unrecorded in the college archives. Examiners will see only the form, the ultimate expression of which is the recording of three credits, with a grade that gives, say, 12 credit points toward an average.

The same is true for the major in biology as for general studies. Experts at the institution have already decided (probably correctly) that two specific courses in biology will provide the opportunity for developing "a knowledge of the animal kingdom in phylogenetic order,"

that two specific courses in biology will provide the opportunity for developing "a knowledge of the animal kingdom in phylogenetic order," that two others will provide the necessary knowledge about "animal and plant cells." The team reassures us that the records show 37 hours or more in biology credits for biology students and that minimum grade point averages have been met. But once again, we are dealing with the element of form, without any real assurance of substance. We deal with form when we deal with courses, or with combinations of courses, and we deal with form when we deal with averages. There is little assurance that real substance is present; it is inferred. Some kind of substance is being recognized, but *is it the substance which will be of value to a teacher?*

In thinking about the matter of form versus substance, the writer has frequently used the illustration of what he calls "College #77." He has imagined two colleges. The first is one of high academic reputation, known for its fruits. It has all of the enviable academic characteristics: Its faculty members win notable prizes. They serve the government in prestigious ways. The library is vast. Teaching load is known to be low, with time for research and publication. Immensely valuable laboratory opportunities exist nearby--institutions for the aged, institutions for the retarded, institutions for the infirm, hospital facilities, psychological services. And, as though that were not enough, the salary schedule is known to be one of the best in the nation.

Contrast with the first example that of College #77. Its salary schedule is known to be as low as its teaching load is high. Its buildings are old; its library well below the academic standards set by professional library formulas. Its physical location is so remote (in the northland, the desert, the prairie) and its climate so uninviting (cold, blizzardy, hot, dusty, arid) that only a dedicated native, fisherman, or prairie man--or a person in flight--would willingly go there.

Imagine the first institution and College #77 to be at competition with one another on the job market. During the past decade, when professors were in short supply, it is inevitable that the first institution got the pick of the litter, the second institution got the runt. And so, over the years, College #77 got to be stocked with the 77ths of every Ph.D. graduating class, if it got stocked at all. Even in 1974, with the supply/demand picture reversed, institutions of the type of College #77 are experiencing some difficulty in developing the hallmarks of academic respectability. Where it once had a shortage of Ph.D.'s, it now has a budget problem.

The illustration is hyperbolic, of course. No institution is staffed only with professors of the lowest potential. Small libraries may restrict but do not necessarily prevent learning. There may be more real learning

taking place in 50-year-old classroom than in the latest example of modern architecture. It must be admitted, however, that many inferences will be made about substance from seeing form. The inevitable conclusion is that more learning takes place under the celebrated scientist than under the unknown professor of chemistry with no scholarly record at all. The opposite may be true, but the conclusion is unlikely. The inevitable conclusion is that professors will teach more and students will learn more when the student/teacher ratio is 15:1 rather than 30:1. It may not be true, but, again, the opposite conclusion is unlikely. This happens for characteristic after characteristic--Ph.D. ratios, supervising ratios in student teaching, numbers of pre-student teaching laboratory experiences, size of the library, research production of the staff, and so on. Inevitably, a conclusion about substance will be reached on the basis of the *credibility of the form* presented. This is obviously unfair. The purpose of accreditation is to identify real substance (learning, development) whenever and wherever it occurs, without regard to the temporal signs and physical objects present.

Administrators in institutions rich in form are seldom disappointed by evaluators who have a difficult time arriving at the conclusion that substance is barren when form is rich. Most evaluators have a difficult time finding an institution unaccreditable when the scene is filled with every technical development known to man, when luminaries of the academic world sit at the front of each classroom, and the endowment of the institution is the envy of every other institution. Substance has not been demonstrated, but it is easily inferred.

Administrators in institutions barren in form take refuge in the exceptions--the research professor who is too busy to communicate with students, the huge libraries which are infrequently used, the talented student body which spends too much time on causes and not enough in the classroom. These exceptions are invariably said to be true for the institutions where the final decision is negative or marginal.

The academic community is plagued by questions which relate to form and to accompanying inferences about quality. The following will illustrate:

--Late afternoon courses, night school, extension teaching, and similar educational offerings. *Do they have the intellectual content and respectability though to exist for the regular day-time, on-campus courses?*

--The use of adjunct faculty members. In schools of education, they are superintendents and principals; in school of business, they come from businesses, and accounting offices. They have full-time jobs as specialists in their own locales. They do not know the students. They are not as available for consultation as full-time professors are. They are usually less familiar with institutional conventions and values. *Do they teach as good a course as the professor with a Ph.D. and no competing outside job?*

--Ph.D. ratio in the faculty. *Is an institution with only 25 percent of its faculty in possession of the terminal degree providing significantly poorer instruction than one with 50 percent?*

--Library size. *Is learning significantly decreased if standards for libraries have not been met?*

--Off-campus teaching. *Can the teaching be as good if conducted in a factory lounge or a secondary school classroom with no accompanying college library or laboratory?*

--Previous academic experiences and records of students. *Can a high school dropout or a student with academic deficiencies, master the content of a college course?*

All of these questions could be answered affirmatively. Some adjunct professors, whatever their other duties, provide excelient instruction. Some night classes are known to be as rich as their day-time counterparts. Some off-campus teaching is of exceptional quality, whatever the library situation. Some students with deficiencies achieve so well as to upset all academic predictions. However, on the basis of "form" alone they are suspect.

So, as evaluators, we must ask ourselves whether we are going to be satisfied with 37 hours of biology, with 56 hours of general study, with 6 hours of student teaching in small-town schools, with a course in educational psychology, with a particular percentage of Ph.D.'s on the faculty; with professors of education who have or have not had public school teaching experiences, with book counts, with periodical counts, with audiovisual machine counts, etc.

If we are, we may be making a mistake. The following true accreditation story will illustrate. An institution wrote glowingly of the wealth of its audiovisual resources. It happened that a team member went looking for them. He found them--all in original crates in the basement. Yet, as long as the institution rests its case about the competence of a graduate on the possession of a B grade for a three-hour course, it will be necessary to evaluate on the basis of form.

If the evaluation of an institution could be based on a system which clearly defined the substance thought to be necessary to professional excellence in teaching and gave some evidence of its presence, accreditation could be based on actual substance much more often than is now the case. If, in a geography course, for example, the institution would define the essential theoretical and verbal concepts which had to be mastered, the scientific and geographical skills which had to be manifested, and the modes of problem solving and thinking which had to be utilized and if it then could produce real evidence about the presence of each desired

outcome in the repertoire of each student, what would it matter that libraries were larger or smaller than one another, that the scholarly production of one professor was less thanthat of another, or that one professor's Ph.D. was earned in a less prestigious university than another's?

The academic community of this country, which has taken men to the moon, must surely have the capability for identifying goals for teaching that are more explicitly stated than "comprehension . . . as to what music really is" or "to equip . . . with at least minimal mathematical competencies."

Those deeply involved in the PBTE movement suggest that this situation, which is such a problem for accrediting agencies, is precisely the problem which their movement seeks to eradicate or correct. The PBTE movement is one which appears to want to come to grips with outcomes rather than with form or process. The task is to define, much more precisely than now seems possible, just what it is that a period of instruction is supposed to develop; to focus every known curricular and learning experience toward that end; and to develop ways of finding out that the desired end, be it a skill or understanding, has been accomplished. The task is extremely difficult.

To the degree that the PBTE movement can result in such a change, accreditation activities can move from being based on elements of "form" to being based on elements of "substance," of achievement, of competence. In simple terms, the movement will give us the following:

Instead of: A three-hour course of covering essentially verbal material about reading (or educational psychology or philosophy or methods), taught by a person with a certain degree, certain specialization, or certain experience, in a classroom rich or poor in its potential for instruction about reading,

We will have: A period of instruction of undetermined length which ends only when each student demonstrates before a competent jury of specialists, his ability to identify successfully six (or four or eight) of the common reading problems beginning readers have and to change existing conditions successfully so that remediation of each problem is effected.

If the PBTE movement is successful, deans of education can say with confidence to superintendents that a certain teacher has demonstrated competence in diagnosing and remedying basic reading difficulties. Accrediting agencies can reassure the public that the teachers graduating from a given institution have more than just a B in a course

in reading--they have demonstrated competence in handling reading problems. The movement has the potential, if it is realized, for moving accreditation activities from a base which is largely one of academic form to a base of competence or accomplishment. More importantly, however, it has the potential for moving instruction and degree work from a base of inferred competence to a base of accomplishment and demonstrated competence. For a professional school, this is important.

Student Qualifications

One of the characteristics of an institution which is most likely to get careful attention from an accrediting agency is its admission of students into a program. Examined also are the steps taken by the institution to maintain an adequate surveillance over students as they progress through the program, eliminating those who do not live up to expectations.

It is characteristic of college units, academic or professional, that they define a high standard for admission to the activities of the group. Invariably, the definition of what "high standard" means is translated from the academic requirements of the moment. A decade or two ago, this would have been translated in schools of education as a respectable score on some test of academic aptitude (depending on one's age, this might have been the ACE Psychological, The Ohio State Psychological, the SAT, or ACT). It has also been defined in terms of one's grade point average after the first two years of college work.

In more recent times, the academic test score is seldom used as an operating admissions criterion, although it is kept for "academic counseling purposes." The single common operating admissions criterion, is the grade point average. This is usually applied flexibly in recognition of the possibility that students who have demonstrated academic deficiencies in their first two years of college (while overcoming the academic deficiencies of high school days) have demonstrated competence in later college years.

The point is that admissions and retention requirements through the years have been largely those associated with typical academic achievement, notably the ability to get good grades in academic courses. Primary among the criteria have been test scores and grade point averages. Probably third in common usage have been the written recommendations of several people--the school principal, the guidance counselor, the pastor, the part-time employer--concerning the ability of the student, as each sees it, to do successful work at a college. And this is important since, after all, the successful completion of a number of academic courses at the college has been the preparation needed for entry into most of the professions.

How is it, we may ask, that institution after institution, through the course of the semesters, offers nothing more than the GPA as an admissions criterion for any student in any field of endeavor. In fields as diverse as history and industrial education, English and home economics, is achievement through 50-odd general credits during freshman and sophomore years an equal predictor of success? Given freedom and encouragement to supplement *general* admissions criteria with *specific* ones which relate to music, to mathematical reasoning, to physical coordination, and so on, why do institutions persist in standing only on the GPA for all teachers in all fields? Are there no valid measures in those fields which admissions committees can trust? Since the predictive ability of the GPA is relatively low, and that of the scholastic aptitude test score even poorer, surely the low predictive ability of both would be sufficient cause to seek other supporting criteria.

The measures we use are relatively functional within the present system. We prepare for professional work (or academic graduation) by passing an array of college courses. The GPA (and to a lesser extent, the scholastic aptitude test score) predicts success in passing college courses about as well as anything else which can be found. Since preparation is largely confined to the successful mastery of a series of courses, what could be more functional than a criterion which predicts successful completion of courses?

And yet, puzzling, irritating, or frustrating admissions phenomena result. The mathematics department that is, in effect, the admissions committee for a school of engineering when it fails or passes students through a required three-course sequence in basic mathematical analysis. The university where a required three-course sequence in statistics keeps the number of doctoral students at a manageable number. The first course in a master's degree program, "Educational Research & Statistics," that acts as a deterrent to retention. The student who wants to major in physical education but who considers another major because of the academic rigors of the required courses in biology and kinesiology.

We do not need to be anti-intellectual. However, we typically use a very narrow segment of human promise in determining the admissions qualifications for a vocational goal which demands many, varied human qualities. In teacher education, qualities such as the ability to make a personal, communicative contact with a young person, to work harmoniously with others, to be patient and accepting may work more wonders than all of the academic excellence which that teacher may have achieved in his college classroom. Many successful men and women have little formal training and could not qualify for admission to a college program which would train them for the field in which they are now successes. The world also has more than a few highly educated persons who have made a brilliant record in the academic classroom but who are failing or are ineffective in their professional work because they cannot communicate

with others or cannot get along successfully with others. As we recognize the characteristics needed for professional success, we can incorporate them into an admissions/retention/graduation progression more consciously and consistently than is now the case.

Again, the PBTE movement has a message of some significance for the accreditation (and collegiate) problem of admissions. It has put the emphasis on performance, on competence, on end results. It asks that professional workers search out as best they can what skills, what understandings, what human characteristics are essential to be a good elementary teacher, an effective physical education instructor, and so on. Although it does not eliminate some kind of "reasonable risk" admissions checks, it is tending to shift our focus from the entry point of training to the departure point, where competencies are demonstrated.

Once professional workers have identified and accepted the basic competencies which are found related to professional success, it should not be difficult to extrapolate admissions criteria related to one or more of these competencies. If some high degree of motor coordination is required in the successful completion of a designed competence in physical education, some test of motor coordination, applied in a reasonable way, might become an admissions check. It is wasteful of human ability and potential to place irrelevant and unnecessary admissions hurdles in the path of a student unless it can be demonstrated that the competencies cannot be developed during the program. PBTE doctrine is bringing with it, among other things, the idea that there may be and usually are a variety of learning experiences through which specific skills can be cultivated and developed. If we find that five such paths exist, that a given skill can be developed through any one of the five, we waste talent and frustrate or anger people needlessly by applying as a *sole* criterion a human characteristic requisite to only one of those paths.

Different Purposes for Accreditation

It is more difficult to draw a clear relationship between the PBTE movement and the problem of the various value options which might be applied to accreditation than it has been to relate PBTE to the three previous problems. We might approach the fourth problem in the following way.

We have seen that there are two ideas associated with accreditation. The first is that an agency can, through the application of minimum standards, identify institutions which can be recommended to the public and to the profession. The second idea is that the application of these same standards can stimulate institutions to improve their programs significantly.

It seems logical to hold that to the degree to which an agency's standards, goals, and desired changes are general or encompassing in nature, they are more in harmony with the idea of stimulation. As they are focused, direct, objective, and of known validity, they are more easily judged by a vigorous application of the standard.

Teacher education is now operating on a moderately generalized basis. There is little consensus about the specific skills, competencies, and training needed for a teacher. The definition of what a "good teacher" is has eluded researchers for many decades. Those who have sought to relate personality characteristics to good teaching have been generally disappointed. Studies which have produced lists of "teacher characteristics" or "teacher competencies" have been quite general. Accrediting agencies seem to be more in a position to stimulate institutions in whatever ways are thought to be productive and less in a position to apply standards in an authoritative and meaningful manner.

Yet, we may be making a mistake if we think of the two positions as representing different kinds of accreditation or different views of accreditation. It seems more logical to view the two positions as end points on a continuum which defines various emphases for the accreditation process. As progress is made within the profession to define the competencies needed by the practitioner and as professionals within the field who are responsible for the training see more efficacious ways to accomplish the goals and ends needed, the accrediting agency can then act with more precision to see that what are now valid and well-defined standards for training are applied with rigor.

Any effort to apply standards rigorously, any effort to force an institution to the expenditure of sums of money, to changes in organization, to the enforcement of higher admissions practices (all of which are common elements in accreditation practice) is, at best, rather futile and an ineffective effort at "do-goodism" *if the standards have no established validity.* Colleges generally accept the sanctions and the advice of accrediting agencies because they share with the agency the belief that the standards, even if unvalidated, define a reasonably good pattern of practice.

The general view of the dissatisfied consumer, however, is that there is a need to apply minimum standards rigorously. Do we have incompetent doctors? Apply standards at a higher level and they will be more competent. Do we have incompetent teachers? Apply standards at a higher and more rigorous level and they will be more competent. The efforts of accrediting agencies in applying standards rigorously are an attempt on their part to seek greater competence for the professional being trained. The agency is reflecting expressions of dissatisfaction with training and professional competence which come from society and often from within the profession itself.

Reputable accrediting agencies are striving to define better standards, to apply them more effectively and fairly, and, in so doing, to improve the quality and competence of the professional trained by the college or university. One of the major problems faced by accrediting agencies--and this certainly includes NCATE--is that of the validation of the standards. The standards represent the "best thinking" of those within the profession. Typically, when an agency decides to re-tool its standards, it calls together its best professionals--practitioners, theoreticians, and others who are touched by that profession. In the hours of discussions which follow, the group slowly produces a set of ideas which it feels represents the best set of characteristics that a training program can have. The group usually tests out its ideas with various populations to see how acceptable the document is. If there is strong sentiment against some particular idea (standard) in one or more populations, the writing group modifies its original statements. In the end, five, ten, or more professionals have produced a set of ideas (standards) which they and their parent populations can accept.

Alexander Astin (then with the American Council on Education and now professor of higher education at UCLA), talking informally one day at a meeting of representatives from most of the accrediting associations, suggested that validation of the standards of the accrediting agencies was the number one job each agency faced. He further suggested that present sets of standards, conceived and written with so much care and attention, were too much a reflection of what he called the "folklore" of higher education which has gone unchallenged and untested in any empirical sense. It was his thought that accrediting agency people, like higher education people, have come to accept as inviolate principles some things which have been a part of higher education for hundreds of years just because they have been practiced for such a long period of time.

This is not to suggest that present sets of standards are completely ineffective. Collegiate practices which have endured for two hundred years have done so because they have been reasonable. Moreover, because each agency has so many standards and because some of them, or some combinations of them, do indeed relate to improvement, the general result from applying standards in the several professional agencies has been a general improvement over the years in the quality of the practitioner produced. The process is general and wasteful, however, and is a bit like shooting a chicken in a farmyard with a shotgun. If the usual comprehensive set of standards could be reduced to the few which really make the difference, teams could be smaller, accreditation reports shortened, and costs reduced. More important than the savings, however, would be the fact that agencies could then bore straight to the heart of the matter and improve the competence of those preparing for the profession much more efficiently.

If the PBTE movement can result in a much more explicit and complete definition of the competencies needed for teachers (and other school workers) and if, after such a definition is made, it can result in significantly improved training modes, the implications for teacher education are great. Since the function of accreditation is to suggest and implement the best of current tested practice, the implications for accreditation are great, too. Finally, if the movement results in a testing of results both in the college and in the field, during training and after entry into the first teaching position, it will have effected a joining together of conceptualization, training, evaluation, and reconceptualization that has never really been done. Training has not been tested in adequate measure nor have training programs been reconceptualized in light of the effectiveness of the graduate. The PBTE movement makes clear that it aims at completing this quartet; to the degree that it does so, the profession may begin to see results that could revolutionize teacher training programs, provide a basis for valid accreditation standards, and provide the accrediting agency with a focus which would enable it to conduct accreditation activities at a much sharper and higher point on the stimulation/application of standards continuum. Put another way, the PBTE movement might provide the experience necessary to move accreditation from its present general unfocused practices to a point of higher efficiency and more focused and direct action.

A LAST LOOK

The purpose of this paper has been to show some relationship between accreditation and the movement known as performance-based or competency-based teacher education.

It has not attempted to discuss all of the problems of accreditation, which are many. It has not attempted to assess the value of the performance-based movement. It has tried to show some points of relationship between the two. It has tried, also, to show how the practice of certain elements associated with the performance-based movement would influence and improve accreditation.

In the final analysis, what is good for teacher education is good for the accreditation of teacher education. Accreditation is sometimes defined as the conscience of teacher education--the conscience which helps us remember to do what we know we should do but which we are not likely to do if we know there is no one looking over our shoulder. Accreditation is also a device for applying to "lazier" institutions the precepts which the more aggressive, the more experimental, have found to be good. It provides still other institutions with the little bit of extra outside pressure which enables those things to get done which would not otherwise be possible within the institution.

To the degree that the performance-based movement is good for teacher education, it provides those involved in accreditation with the material they need for revising and improving standards, which can, in turn, be applied in the contexts mentioned above. PBTE does not operate with the idea of improving the accreditation of teacher education--it operates to improve teacher education, and in so doing, it provides help for the auxiliary services surrounding teacher education, one of which is accreditation.

ABOUT ERIC

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) forms a nationwide information system established by the U.S. Office of Education, designed to serve and advance American education. Its basic objective is to provide ideas and information on significant current documents (e.g., research reports, articles, theoretical papers, program descriptions, published and unpublished conference papers, newsletters, and curriculum guides or studies) and to publicize the availability of such documents. Central ERIC is the term given to the function of the U.S. Office of Education, which provides policy, coordination, training funds, and general services to the clearinghouses in the information system. Each clearinghouse focuses its activities on a separate subject-matter area; acquires, evaluates, abstracts, and indexes documents; processes many significant documents into the ERIC system; and publicizes available ideas and information to the education community through its own publications, those of Central ERIC, and other educational media.

TEACHER EDUCATION AND ERIC

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, established June 20, 1968, is sponsored by three professional groups--the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (fiscal agent); the Association of Teacher Educators; and Instruction and Professional Development, National Education Association. It is located at One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

SCOPE OF CLEARINGHOUSE ACTIVITIES

Users of this guide are encouraged to send to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education documents related to its scope, a statement of which follows:

> *The Clearinghouse is responsible for research reports, curriculum descriptions, theoretical papers, addresses, and other materials relative to the preparation of school personnel (nursery, elementary, secondary, and supporting school personnel); the preparation and development of teacher educators; the profession of teaching; and the fields of health, physical education, and recreation. The scope includes the preparation and continuing development of all instructional personnel, their functions and roles. While the major interest of the Clearinghouse is professional preparation and practice in America, it also is interested in international aspects of the field.*

The scope also guides the Clearinghouse's Advisory and Policy Council and staff in decision making relative to the commissioning of monographs, bibliographies, and directories. The scope is a flexible guide in the idea and information needs of those concerned with pre- and in-service preparation of school personnel and the profession of teaching.